

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for holding an interview with Applicants' representative. The Examiner's kind remarks are incorporated herein.

Claims 1 and 5-19 were pending in this application when last examined.

Claim 1 stands rejected.

Claims 5-11 were objected to.

Claims 12-19 were withdrawn.

Claims 1-11 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer thereto.

Claims 20-37 are newly added. Support can be found in claims 1 and 5-11.

In particular, claim 20 recites the limited modified bases as the Examiner suggested during the interview. Claim 20 also recites a microbial nucleic acid-specific N⁶-methyladenine. Applicants assert that this base is not disclosed in the Karras reference.

Claim 21 is not substantially changed from claim 5. Applicants note that SEQ ID NO: 4 contains the microbial nucleic acid-specific N⁶-methyladenine.

Claim 22 is from cancelled claim 8, and claim 23 is from cancelled claim 9.

Claim 24 is changed into independent form based on claim 6, which comprises the immunopotentiator of cancelled claim 1 and the subject matter of cancelled claim 6.

Claim 25 is from the subject matter of cancelled claim 5.

Claim 29 recites the nucleic acid modified bases of cancelled claim 1. Applicants believe that these modified bases are free from the Karras reference because the reference never teaches or suggest enhancement of immunoactivity by using the modified bases. It is noted that this claim is a process.

Claims 30-32 are from the subject matters of cancelled claims 5, 8 and 9, respectively.

Claim 33 is based on claims 11 and 15 and is changed to comprise the immunopotentiator of cancelled claim 1 and the subject matter of cancelled claim 6.

Claims 34-37 are from cancelled claims 4, 7, 8 and 9, respectively.

Thus, no new matter has been added.

In items 5-7 on pages 2-5 of the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Karras. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as applied to the new claims. In particular, as noted above, claim 20 which reflects the subject matter of claim 1 is limited to modified bases not taught in Karras. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully contend that Karras fails to teach N⁶-methyladenine. Thus, this rejection is untenable and should be withdrawn.

In item 8 on page 5 of the Office Action, claims 5-11 were objected to. This objection is moot as applied to the new claims as such claims have been rewritten in independent form.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing Amendments and Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is hereby requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroyuki KAMIYA et al.

/William R.

By Schmidt, II/

Digitally signed by William R.
Schmidt, II/
DN: cn=William R. Schmidt, II, o.ou,
email=bschmidt@wendroth.com,
c=US,
Date: 2010.10.22 15:00:17 -0400/

William R. Schmidt, II
Registration No. 58,327
Attorney for Applicants

WRS/rgf
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 22, 2010